

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

RECEIVED
U.S. DISTRICT COURT, CHARLESTON, S.C.

2008 DEC -3 A 11:33

John Alan Miller,) C/A No.2:08-3836-JFA-RSC
)
Plaintiff,)
)
vs.)
)
) Report and Recommendation
South Carolina Dept. Of Probation,)
Parole and Pardon Services,)
)
Defendant.)

The Plaintiff, John Alan Miller (Plaintiff), proceeding *pro se*, files this civil complaint, which is construed as an action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.¹ Plaintiff is an inmate at Kershaw Correctional Institution, a facility of the South Carolina Department of Corrections (SCDC), and files this action *in forma pauperis* under 28 U.S.C. § 1915. The complaint names as the sole Defendant the South Carolina Department of Probation, Parole, and Pardon Services (SCDPPPS).² The complaint should be dismissed for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted.

¹ Pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1)(B), and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d), D.S.C., the undersigned is authorized to review such complaints for relief and submit findings and recommendations to the District Court.

² Title 28 U.S.C. § 1915A (a) requires review of a "complaint in a civil action in which a prisoner seeks redress from a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity."

Pro Se and In Forma Pauperis Review

Under established local procedure in this judicial district, a careful review has been made of the *pro se* complaint pursuant to the procedural provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915; 28 U.S.C. § 1915A; and the Prison Litigation Reform Act, Pub. L. No. 104-134, 110 Stat. 1321 (1996). This review has been conducted in light of the following precedents: *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25 (1992); *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 324-25 (1989); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519 (1972); *Nasim v. Warden, Md. House of Corr.*, 64 F.3d 951 (4th Cir. 1995) (*en banc*); *Todd v. Baskerville*, 712 F.2d 70 (4th Cir. 1983).

The complaint herein has been filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915, which permits an indigent litigant to commence an action in federal court without prepaying the administrative costs of proceeding with the lawsuit. To protect against possible abuses of this privilege, the statute allows a district court to dismiss the case upon a finding that the action "fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted" or is "frivolous or malicious." § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i), (ii). A finding of frivolity can be made where the complaint "lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact." *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. at 31. Hence, under § 1915(e)(2)(B), a claim based on a meritless legal theory may be dismissed *sua sponte*. *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319 (1989); *Allison v. Kyle*, 66 F.3d 71 (5th Cir. 1995).

This Court is required to liberally construe *pro se* documents, *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97 (1976), holding them to a less stringent standard than those drafted by attorneys, *Hughes v. Rowe*, 449 U.S. 9 (1980) (*per curiam*). Even under this less stringent standard, however, the *pro se* complaint is subject to summary dismissal. The mandated liberal construction afforded to *pro se* pleadings means that if the Court can reasonably read the pleadings to state a valid claim on which the Plaintiff could prevail, it should do so, but a district court may not rewrite a petition to include claims that were never presented, *Barnett v. Hargett*, 174 F.3d 1128, 1133 (10th Cir. 1999), construct the Plaintiff's legal arguments for him, *Small v. Endicott*, 998 F.2d 411, 417-18 (7th Cir. 1993), or "conjure up questions never squarely presented" to the court, *Beaudett v. City of Hampton*, 775 F.2d 1274, 1278 (4th Cir. 1985). The requirement of liberal construction does not mean that the Court can ignore a clear failure in the pleading to allege facts which set forth a claim currently cognizable in a federal district court. *Weller v. Dep't of Soc. Servs.*, 901 F.2d 387, (4th Cir. 1990).

Background

Plaintiff claims that the South Carolina Department of Probation, Parole, and Pardon Services (SCDPPPS) has "repeatedly denied, neglected and ignored [Plaintiff's] repeated request[s] for a copy of [Plaintiff's] file." Plaintiff claims that this alleged denial of "access to seemingly public records" violates the Federal

Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) and Plaintiff's Constitutional rights. Plaintiff seeks monetary damages and a complete copy of his file from the Defendant.

Discussion

As an initial matter, to the extent Plaintiff seeks relief pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, the agency Defendant, SCDPPPS, is protected by Eleventh Amendment immunity.³ Although the Eleventh Amendment's language does not explicitly prohibit a citizen of a state from suing his own state in federal court, the Supreme Court in *Hans v. Louisiana*, 134 U. S. 1 (1889), held that the purposes of the Eleventh Amendment, i.e. protection of a state treasury, would not be served if a state could be sued by its citizens in federal court. Thus, the Eleventh Amendment forbids a federal court from rendering a judgment against an unconsenting state in favor of a citizen of that state. *Edelman v. Jordan*, 415 U. S. 651, 663 (1974).

Agencies of the state share this immunity when they are the alter egos of the state. Even though the state is not named as a party to the instant action, the suit may be barred by the Eleventh Amendment if the plaintiff, a private party, seeks to recover money from the state's public funds. *Edelman*, 415 U.S. at 663. In the case *sub judice*, Plaintiff seeks damages which are barred by the

³ The Eleventh Amendment provides: "The judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity, commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by Citizens of another State, or by Citizens or Subjects of any Foreign State."

Eleventh Amendment.⁴ In addition, to the extent Plaintiff may be seeking injunctive relief, the Eleventh Amendment also bars this Court from granting such relief against the state or its agencies. See *Seminole Tribe of Florida v. Florida*, 517 U.S. 44, 58 (1996) ("the relief sought by a plaintiff suing a State is irrelevant to the question whether the suit is barred by the Eleventh Amendment"); *Alabama v. Pugh*, 438 U. S. 781 (1978). Therefore, any § 1983 claims the Plaintiff may be attempting to allege against the SCDPPPS should be dismissed.

Plaintiff's complaint also claims the state agency Defendant has failed to comply with his requests for information under the Federal Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). However, the Plaintiff is not entitled to relief under the Federal FOIA, codified at 5 U.S.C. § 552 *et seq.* The Federal FOIA is applicable to agencies or departments of the Government of the United States, and is not applicable to agencies or departments of a state. See 5 U.S.C. § 551(1). See also, *Grand Cent. Partnership, Inc. v. Cuomo*, 166 F.3d 473, 484 (2d Cir. 1999) ("it is beyond question that FOIA applies only to federal and not to state agencies"); *Philip Morris, Inc., v. Harshbarger*, 122 F.3d 58, 83 (1st Cir. 1997) ("FOIA . . . applies only to federal executive branch agencies"); *St. Michael's Convalescent Hosp. v. California*, 643 F.2d 1369, 1373 (9th Cir.

⁴While the United States Congress can override Eleventh Amendment immunity through legislation, Congress has not overridden the states' Eleventh Amendment immunity in § 1983 cases. See *Quern v. Jordan*, 440 U. S. 332, 343 (1979).

1981) (definition of "agency" under FOIA "does not encompass state agencies or bodies"); *Johnson v. Wells*, 566 F.2d 1016, 1018 (5th Cir. 1978) (state board of parole not agency within meaning of FOIA). Therefore, Plaintiff's Federal FOIA claim against the South Carolina Department of Probation, Parole, and Pardon Services is subject to summary dismissal.

Recommendation

Accordingly, it is recommended that the District Court dismiss the complaint in the above-captioned case *without prejudice* and without issuance of service of process. See *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. at 31; *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. at 324-25; *Todd v. Baskerville* 712 F.2d at 74. Plaintiff's attention is directed to the important notice on the next page.



Robert S. Carr
United States Magistrate Judge

December **3**, 2008
Charleston, South Carolina

Notice of Right to File Objections to Report and Recommendation

The parties are advised that they may file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation with the District Court Judge. Objections must specifically identify the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections are made and the basis for such objections. In the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must "only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation." *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310 (4th Cir. 2005).

Specific written objections must be filed within ten (10) days of the date of service of this Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). The time calculation of this ten-day period excludes weekends and holidays and provides for an additional three (3) days for filing by mail. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a) & (e). Filing by mail pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 5 may be accomplished by mailing objections to:

Larry W. Propes, Clerk
United States District Court
P. O. Box 835
Charleston, South Carolina 29402

Failure to timely file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation will result in waiver of the right to appeal from a judgment of the District Court based upon such Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985).